

## **REMARKS**

Claims 99-104 are new; claims 1, 11, 15, and 22 are amended; claims 33-98 are cancelled; and claims 1-31 and 99-104 are pending in the application.

Regarding the §102(b) rejection of claim 1 based on U.S. Patent No. 6,243,093 to Czerwinski Fox et al. (hereinafter "Czerwinski"), Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite selectively displaying second visual information representing each of a subset of a plurality of information objects, the second visual information being different than the first visual information. This amendment is supported by, for example, paragraphs [0121] and [0122] of the specification.

Czerwinski does not disclose selectively displaying second visual information representing each of a subset of a plurality of information objects that is different than first visual information. Instead, Czerwinski discloses displaying a plurality of objects as thumbnails in a first view. Although the thumbnails are augmented with a bar meter, gradient, segmented bar, or other visual device which indicates a degree to which the information object satisfies an implicit query, the same thumbnails are used to represent the information objects. Accordingly, Czerwinski does not disclose displaying second visual information representing a subset of information objects that is different than the displayed first visual information representing the information objects.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described above in relation to claim 1.

Regarding the §102(b) rejection of claim 6 based on Czerwinski, Applicants respectfully assert that Czerwinski does not disclose a visualization type useful for demonstrating temporal relationships, a visualization type useful for demonstrating parent-child relationships, or a visualization type useful for demonstrating geospatial relationships.

The Examiner asserts that col. 22 lines 14-65 of Czerwinski disclose these visualization types. Col. 22 lines 14-65 discloses several ways displaying objects, one of which is a selected object. However, Czerwinski does not disclose a relationship between the objects other than the fact that one of the objects is selected. Czerwinski does not disclose a temporal relationship between the objects, a parent-child relationship between the objects, or a geospatial relationship between the objects. Accordingly, Czerwinski does not disclose a visualization type useful for demonstrating temporal relationships, a visualization type useful for demonstrating parent-child relationships, or a visualization type useful for demonstrating geospatial relationships as recited by claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants assert that claim 6 is allowable.

Claims 7-10 depend from claim 6 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described above in relation to claim 6.

Regarding the §102(b) rejection of claim 11 based on Czerwinski, Applicants have amended claim 11 to recite information objects comprising a data field and a data value associated with the data field. This amendment is supported by, for example, paragraphs [0128] - [0135] of the specification.

The Office identifies col. 12 lines 1-55 of Czerwinski as disclosing information objects, a query, a query result set, a plane or line representing a data field, nodes representing data values, and links showing correlations among fields and values. This section of Czerwinski discloses objects, object thumbnails, a three-dimensional plane on which the objects may be manipulated, and visual landmarks. However, Czerwinski's plane is merely an environment in which object thumbnails may be arranged. Czerwinski's plane is not related to a data field of the objects or object thumbnails and thus Czerwinski does not disclose a plane or line representing a data field of a data object as recited by claim 11.

Furthermore, Czerwinski does not disclose data fields or data values of the objects or object thumbnails arranged on Czerwinski's plane. Accordingly, Czerwinski does not disclose a visualization including glyphs representing information objects, one of a plane or line representing the data field, nodes representing data values, and links showing correlations as recited by claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-recited limitations of claim 11 are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 for the above-mentioned compelling reasons.

Claims 12-21 depend from claim 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described above in relation to claim 11.

Claim 22 recites similar limitations to claim 11 and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons described above in relation to claim 11. Claims 23-32 depend from

claim 22 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons described above in relation to claim 22.

New claim 99 is supported by, for example, paragraph [0096] of the specification.

New claims 100 and 101 are supported by, for example, paragraph [0100] of the specification.

New claim 102 is supported by, for example, paragraph [0121] of the specification.

New claims 103 and 104 are supported by, for example, paragraphs [0127]-[0135] of the specification.

For the reasons discussed above, pending claims 1-31 and 99-104 are allowable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests formal allowance of such pending claims in the Examiner's next action.

Respectfully submitted

Dated: 29 Nov 2007

By: Paul Holdaway  
Paul Holdaway  
Reg. No. 56,376  
Wells St. John P.S.